arXiv:1607.08198v1 [math.AG] 27 Jul 2016

RIGID DIVISORS ON SURFACES

ANDREAS HOCHENEGGER AND DAVID PLOOG

Abstract. We study effective divisors D on surfaces with $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$. We give a numerical criterion for such divisors, following a general investigation of negativity, rigidity and connectivity properties. Examples include exceptional loci of rational singularities, and spherelike divisors.

Contents

1. Properties of divisors: negativity, rigidity, connectivity 4
2. Relations among divisors properties 7
3. Numerical characterisation of curvelike divisors 12
4. Minimally curvelike divisors 14
5. Spherelike divisors 21
6. Negative definite divisors and rational singularities 25
7. Classification of minimally curvelike divisors 28
References 30

Introduction

In this article, we investigate effective divisors D on a smooth algebraic surface X which are well-connected ($H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$) and rigid as sheaves on X (i.e. $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$). We call such a divisor *curvelike*; necessarily $D^2 = -n < 0$, and we also call D a $(-n)$-*divisor*.

Such divisors always consist of negative, rational curves. We don't discuss here negative curves on a fixed surface; for this, and the Bounded Negativity Conjecture, see [4].

We have two principal motivations for this work. Geometrically, rigid and negative definite divisors arise as exceptional loci of rational singularities. In particular, for $n = 1$ they come from blowing up a smooth point, and for $n = 2$ numerical fundamental cycles of ADE singularities are examples. More generally, those cycles of rational singularities are always curvelike, see Proposition 6.8.

Homologically, the structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_D$ of a (-2)-divisor is a 2-spherelike object in the sense of [10], i.e. $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ and $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = 0$. By our previous work, for such D there exists a natural, maximal subcategory of $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$ in which $\mathcal{O}_D$ becomes a 2-Calabi–Yau object. In this article, we do not attempt to compute the spherical subcategory, but we address the asphericity of $\mathcal{O}_D$ in Proposition 5.6 and Example 5.8.

We start out, in Section 1, with a systematic study of divisors centered around negativity, rigidity and connectivity. Here we list the non-standard notions in a very terse fashion; for more elaborate definitions and comments, see the referenced subsections. Let D be an effective divisor; all C_i occurring below are reduced, irreducible curves.

Negativity (Subsection 1.1). D is *negatively closed* if $A^2 < 0$ for any $0 \prec A \preceq D$. It is *negative definite* if kA is negatively closed for all $k \geq 1$. It is *negatively filtered* if there is $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ with $C_i.(C_i + \cdots + C_m) < 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

Rigidity (Subsection 1.2). D is *rigid as a subscheme* if $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$. It is *Jacobi rigid* if $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = 0$. It is *rigid* if D is rigid as a subscheme and Jacobi rigid, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_D$ is an infinitesimally rigid sheaf on X.

Connectivity (Subsection 1.3). D is *well-connected* if $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$. It is *1-connected* if $A.(D-A) \geq 1$ for all $0 \prec A \prec D$. It is *1-decomposable* if there is $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ with $C_i.(C_{i+1} + \cdots + C_m) = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$.

Our results about these properties are most concisely summed up in the following schematic. The ornaments c and n indicate that a property is *closed under subdivisors* or *numerical*, respectively; see Definition 2.11. By Proposition 2.15, all these properties are birationally invariant.



The crucial new notion is that of 1-decomposability, because it enables a combinatorial grip on $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = 0$. One of our main results is the following characterisation for curvelike divisors; see Theorem 3.1.

Theorem A. *An effective divisor is curvelike if and only if it is is rational, 1-decomposable and negatively filtered.*

We are interested in simplifying a curvelike divisor D on X, possibly using other surfaces. Such a simplificiation can be

birational: if there is a contraction $\pi\colon X \to X'$ such that $D' = \pi(D)$ is a curvelike divisor on X' with $D = \pi^* D'$. For this to be possible, there has to be a (-1)-curve $E \subset X$ with $E.D = 0$.

homological: while (-1)-curves induce contractions, i.e. categorical decompositions of the derived category, a (-2)-curve C gives rise to an autoequivalence, the spherical twist $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_C}$. If $C \prec D$ with $C.D = -1$, then $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_C(-1)}(\mathcal{O}_D) = \mathcal{O}_{D-C}$, and we say that C *can be twisted off* D.

numerical: a sum $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_m$ with curvelike divisors D_i such that $D_i.(D_{i+1} + \cdots + D_m) = 1$ and $-2 \geq D_i^2 \geq D^2$ for all i is called a *curvelike decomposition*; see Definition 4.12.

There always is a decomposition in the numerical sense with strong properties; the following result is Theorem 4.13.

Theorem B. *Any $(-n)$-divisor has a curvelike decomposition where all parts are pullbacks of either curves C or chains of type* 

such that $C^2, -m-1 \in \{-2, \dots, -n\}$.

An alternative definition of $(-n)$-divisors D is $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_C)$ and $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_C(C))$, where C is a smooth rational curve such that $C^2 = -n$, see Lemma 1.5. In Proposition 4.19, we show that likewise $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(K_X)) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_C(K_X))$ and $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D+K_X)) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_C(C+K_X))$.

We say that D is *essentially a $(-n)$-curve*, if D can be obtained from a $(-n)$-curve through blow-ups and spherical twists, see Definition 4.8. At the other extreme, we call D *minimally curvelike* if neither operation is possible. For general reasons, certain low-degree divisors are always essentially curves; see Corollary 4.15, Corollary 4.11, Proposition 7.3, respectively.

Theorem C. *A divisor which is exceptional, or spherical, or reduced and spherelike is essentially a curve.*

Moreover, the building blocks, i.e. minimally curvelike divisors, can be enumerated. For instance, there are five minimal (-2)-divisors on five curves; see Example 7.2:



The question remains whether such graphs can be realised as dual intersection graphs of effective divisors. In Proposition 7.6, we give a sufficient condition which is enough to deal with the above examples. This seems to be a subtle problem, and it would be interesting to study it in greater depth.

Conventions. We work over an algebraically closed field $\Bbbk$. Throughout this article, we consider a smooth algebraic surface, usually denoted X, and projective divisors on it. The canonical divisor on X is written K_X and, sometimes, just K. The structure sheaf of the surface is denoted $\mathcal{O}$ instead of $\mathcal{O}_X$. Curves are always irreducible and reduced. By a $(-n)$-curve, we mean a smooth rational curve on X of self-intersection $-n$.

Hom and Ext^i refer to homorphism and extension spaces on the surface, unless we explicitly specify another variety. Occasionally, we abbreviate dimensions $\hom(M,N) \coloneqq \dim \operatorname{Hom}(M,N)$ and $h^i(M) \coloneqq \dim H^i(M)$. The Hom complex of two sheaves M, N is $\operatorname{Hom}^\bullet(M,N) \coloneqq \bigoplus_i \operatorname{Ext}^i(M,N)[-i]$; it is a complex of vector spaces with zero differentials.

Sometimes we use $M' \hookrightarrow M \twoheadrightarrow M''$ as a short hand for a short exact sequence. Distinguished triangles in $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$ are shown as $M' \to M \to M''$, omitting the connecting morphism $M'' \to M'[1]$, and called just 'triangles'. We do not adorn the symbol for derived functors, e.g. $f_*\colon \mathcal{D}^b(X) \to \mathcal{D}^b(Y)$ for a proper scheme morphism $f\colon X \to Y$.

We depict divisors consisting of rational curves by their dual intersection graphs:

denotes a reduced (-1)-curve,

a double (-3)-curve, 

two (-2)-curves intersecting in one point, and

two (-3)-curves intersecting in two points.

1. Properties of divisors: negativity, rigidity, connectivity

Let X be a smooth, algebraic, i.e. quasi-projective surface, defined over an algebraically closed field $\Bbbk$. A *curve* on X will always mean an irreducible, reduced effective divisor, not necessarily smooth. Therefore, given an effective divisor D on X, we will speak of its *curve decomposition* $D = \sum_i c_i C_i$, where the C_i are pairwise distinct curves and all c_i are positive.

In this section, we typographically distinguish whether we *recall* an established notion or ***introduce*** a new one.

Intersection numbers and Euler characteristics. The intersection number of divisors can be computed cohomologically with the Euler characteristic:

Lemma 1.1. *Let A and B be two effective divisors on X. Then*

$$A.B = \chi(\mathcal{O}_A) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_B) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{A+B}) = -\chi(\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{O}_B),$$

and, in particular, $A^2 = -\chi(\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{O}_A)$.

Proof. We start with the well-known formula, see e.g. [9, Ex. V.1.1]: $A.B = \chi(\mathcal{O}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}(-A)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}(-B)) + \chi(\mathcal{O}(-A-B))$; replacing X by an auxiliary compactification, if needed. This statement holds for all (projective) divisors, not only effective. The first equation follows immediately, using ideal sheaf sequences. For the second one, compute

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{O}_B) &= \chi(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}_B) - \chi(\mathcal{O}(-A), \mathcal{O}_B) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_B) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_B(A)) = \\ &= \big(\chi(\mathcal{O}) - \chi(\mathcal{O}(-B))\big) - \big(\chi(\mathcal{O}(A)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}(A-B))\big) = -A.B \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

For an effective divisor D on X, we have the Riemann–Roch formula for the Euler characteristic of its structure sheaf:

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_D) = -\tfrac{1}{2}(D^2 + D.K_X).$$

Lemma 1.2 (Decomposition sequence)**.** *If $A + B$ be a sum of effective divisors, then there is a short exact sequence*

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_A(-B) \to \mathcal{O}_{A+B} \to \mathcal{O}_B \to 0.$$

Proof. We just include the proof for the homological fun of it. Consider the following commutative diagram of ideal sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-A-B) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{A+B} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-B) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_B & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where ι is the inclusion and π the restriction. The Snake Lemma tells us that π is surjective with kernel isomorphic to $\operatorname{coker} \iota = \mathcal{O}_A(-B)$. $\square$

1.1. Negativity properties of divisors.

The negativity of a divisor D can be measured in several ways:

- D is *negative* if $D^2 < 0$.
- D is *negative definite* if $A^2 < 0$ for all $0 \prec A$ with $\operatorname{supp}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(D)$.
- D is ***negatively closed*** if $A^2 < 0$ for all $0 \prec A \preceq D$.
- D is ***negatively filtered*** if $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ with curves C_i such that $C_i.(C_i + \cdots + C_m) < 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

In words, D is negatively closed if all effective subdivisors are negative. By contrast, D is negative definite if every divisor supported on (a subset of) D is negative, i.e. the intersection matrix of the curve components of D is negative definite; in particular, D is negatively closed. Note that negative definiteness only depends on the curve configuration underlying D.

Lemma 1.3. *A negatively closed divisor D is negatively filtered.*

Proof. More precisely, we show that any curve C in a negatively closed divisor D with $C.D < 0$ can be extended to a negative filtration of D.

First, we note that a negatively closed divisor D contains a curve $C_1 \coloneqq C$ with $C.D < 0$, otherwise $D^2 = \sum_{C \prec D} C.D \geq 0$, a contradiction. Now proceed by induction with $D - C$ which is negatively closed as well. □

Example 1.4. Let $D = 2E + A + A' + B =$ 

. Then A, A', E, B, E is a negative filtration for D. However, $D^2 = -4-3-3-2+2(2+2+2) = 0$, so that D is not negatively closed.

Example 6.15 gives a negatively closed divisor which is not negative definite.

1.2. **Rigidity properties of divisors.** An effective divisor D is called

- *rigid* (as a sheaf) if the first order infinitesimal deformations of its structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_D$, as a sheaf on X, are trivial, i.e. $\operatorname{Ext}^1_X(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = 0$.
- *rigid as a subscheme* if all first order infinitesimal deformations of D as a closed subscheme of X are trivial. As these infinitesimal deformations are classified by global sections of the normal bundle of D in X, this condition amounts to $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$.
- *Jacobi rigid* if there are no first order infinitesimal deformations of $\mathcal{O}_D$ as a degree zero line bundle on D. This amounts to $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = 0$ which is the tangent space of the Jacobian $\operatorname{Pic}^0(D)$ at $[\mathcal{O}_D]$.
- *rational* if all curves in D are smooth, rational curves.

Lemma 1.5. *For any effective divisor D on X, there are canonical isomorphisms of vector spaces*

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) &= H^0(\mathcal{O}_D), \\
\operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) &= H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) \oplus H^1(\mathcal{O}_D), \\
\operatorname{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) &= H^1(\mathcal{O}_D(D)).
\end{aligned}$$

Especially, D rigid $\iff$ D rigid as a subscheme and D Jacobi rigid.

Proof. Denote by $i\colon D \hookrightarrow X$ the inclusion. We make use of the adjunction $i^* \dashv i_*$ of exact functors between the derived categories $\mathcal{D}^b(D)$ and $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$. The derived functor i_* indeed preserves boundedness of complexes: D is a hypersurface, hence Gorenstein, and thus any object in $\mathcal{D}^b(D)$ has a finite injective resolution of quasi-coherent sheaves. Note that there is an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_D = i_*\mathcal{O}_D \cong [\mathcal{O}(-D) \to \mathcal{O}]$ in $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$ and therefore a decomposition

$i^*i_*\mathcal{O}_D = \mathcal{O}_D \oplus \mathcal{O}_D(-D)[1]$. Now we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_X(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) &= \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_X(i_*\mathcal{O}_D, i_*\mathcal{O}_D[1]) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_D(i^*i_*\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D[1]) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_D(\mathcal{O}_D \oplus \mathcal{O}_D(-D)[1], \mathcal{O}_D[1]) \\ &= \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_D(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D[1]) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet_D(\mathcal{O}_D(-D), \mathcal{O}_D) \\ &= H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D) \oplus H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D))[-1]. \qquad \square\end{aligned}$$

Example 1.6. We give a standard example of a curve that is rigid as a subscheme but not Jacobi rigid: Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a smooth cubic; in particular, $C^2 = 9$. Blowing up $\mathbb{P}^2$ in eleven points lying on C, the total transform of C is $D = \bar{C} + E_1 + \cdots + E_{11}$, where $\bar{C}$ is the strict transform of C. As the intersection pairing is preserved, we get $9 = C^2 = D^2 = \bar{C}^2 - 11 + 20$, hence $\bar{C}$ is an elliptic curve with $\bar{C}^2 = -2$. It is rigid as a subscheme but $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{C}}$ deforms in view of $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\bar{C}}) = \Bbbk$. By Riemann–Roch, $\bar{C}.K_X = 2$.

1.3. **Connectivity properties of divisors.** There are several notions how well connected an effective divisor might be.

- D is *connected* if it has connected support.
- D is *well-connected* if $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$.
- D is *(numerically) 1-connected* if $A.(D - A) \geq 1$ for any $0 \prec A \prec D$.

A well-connected effective divisor is connected. For reduced divisors, the three notions are equivalent.

Example 1.7. Let E be a (-1)-curve, i.e. a smooth, rational curve with $E^2 = -1$. The decomposition sequence for $2E$ easily gives $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{2E}) = \Bbbk^3$.

Lemma 1.8 ([5, Cor. II.12.3])**.** *1-connected divisors are well-connected.*

Example 1.9. Consider the divisor $D =$ 

consisting of a triangle of rational curves, each of multiplicity two. The divisor is not 1-connected: $D^2_{\mathrm{red}} = -1 - 2 - 3 + 2 \cdot 3 = 0$. Starting from the decomposition sequence for $D = D_{\mathrm{red}} + D_{\mathrm{red}}$, one can check that D is well-connected.

Question 1.10. Are there well-connected tree divisors which are not 1-connected?

This is about the reverse of 1-connected $\Longrightarrow$ well-connected. The previous Example 1.9 is a counterexample, but it is not a tree.

We consider two more conditions related to connectivity:

- D is a *tree* if the dual intersection graph of D is a tree.
- D is ***1-decomposable*** if it can be written as $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ with $C_i.(C_{i+1} + \cdots + C_m) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$.

Regarding the definition of trees, many sources include the condition that all curves are smooth and rational. For our purposes it is better to distinguish between these properties (e.g. in the next paragraph).

Any divisor that is a reduced tree of curves has a 1-decomposition, by inductively pruning the leaves. In Proposition 2.10 and Lemma 2.8, we show that 1-decomposable divisors are 1-connected trees.

1.4. **Curvelike and $(-n)$-divisors.** We introduce two cohomological properties an effective divisor D might enjoy.

- D is ***curvelike*** if D is well-connected and rigid.
- D is a ***$(-n)$-divisor*** if D is well-connected and rigid with $D^2 = -n$.

Every rigid divisor D has $-D^2 = \chi(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) > 0$. Thus, a curvelike divisor D is a $(-n)$-divisor for $-D^2 = n < 0$. We have chosen this terminology because curvelike divisors behave cohomologically like negative rational curves, and we say 'curvelike' when the self-intersection number does not matter.

By Lemma 1.5, D is a $(-n)$-divisor if and only if $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = \Bbbk^{n-1}$ and $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$. Assuming the other three provisions, $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = \Bbbk^{n-1}$ can be replaced with $D^2 = -n$.

We consider some special cases of this notion:

- D is *exceptional* if D is a (-1)-divisor.
- D is ***spherelike*** if D is a (-2)-divisor.
- D is *spherical* if it is spherelike and invariant under twisting with the canonical bundle of X, i.e. $\mathcal{O}(K_X)|_D \cong \mathcal{O}_D$.

To say that the divisor D is exceptional, or spherelike, or spherical, is just a shortcut for the sheaf $\mathcal{O}_D \in \mathcal{D}^b(X)$ being an exceptional object ([12, §8.3]), or a 2-spherelike object ([10]), or a 2-spherical object ([12, §8.1]), respectively.

In the definition of curvelike divisors, the condition of being well-connected is crucial. The next remark spells out what happens when it is dropped, in the first non-trivial case ($n = 2$).

Remark 1.11. Let D be a rigid divisor with $D^2 = -2$, i.e. we drop the condition that D be well-connected from the definition of spherelike. Due to $1 \leq \hom(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) \leq 2$, there are only two possibilities:

- $\hom(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = 1$, i.e. D is spherelike as defined above;
- $\hom(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = 2$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_D \in \mathcal{D}^b(X)$ a 0-spherelike object; see [10].

Because $\Bbbk$ is algebraically closed, the 0-spherelike case in turn leads to either $\operatorname{End}(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk[x]/x^2$ or $\operatorname{End}(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk \times \Bbbk$. Examples for these two types are ⓪—② and the disconnected divisor ① ①, respectively. The first of these shows that in the definition of curvelike divisors, it is not enough to ask for rigidity and connectedness.

2. Relations among divisors properties

2.1. **Properties of rigid divisors.**

Lemma 2.1. *A rigid divisor is negative.*

Proof. We have $-D^2 = \chi(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = \hom(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) + \operatorname{ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) > 0$ with $\operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = 0$ because $\mathcal{O}_D$ is rigid. □

Lemma 2.2. *Any effective subdivisor of a rigid divisor is rigid.*
Likewise with 'rigid' replaced by 'Jacobi rigid' or 'rigid as a subscheme'.

Proof. Let $D = A + B$ be a decomposition of D into two effective divisors.

First assume that D is Jacobi rigid, i.e. $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = 0$. The long exact cohomology sequence of the decomposition sequence $0 \to \mathcal{O}_B(-A) \to \mathcal{O}_D \to$

$\mathcal{O}_A \to 0$ contains a surjection $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) \twoheadrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_A)$, thus $H^1(\mathcal{O}_A) = 0$, and A is also Jacobi rigid.

Now assume D is rigid as a subscheme, i.e. $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$. Tensoring the other decomposition sequence $0 \to \mathcal{O}_A(-B) \to \mathcal{O}_D \to \mathcal{O}_B \to 0$ with $\mathcal{O}(D)$ yields an injection $H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(A)) \hookrightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D))$. So $H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(A)) = 0$, and hence A is rigid as a subscheme of X.

By Lemma 1.5, both cases together imply that A is rigid when D is. □

These two lemmas combine to the following statement:

Corollary 2.3. *A rigid divisor is negatively closed.*

Example 2.4. The sum of two rigid divisors does not have to be rigid: Let C be a curve with $C^2 = 0$, e.g. the fibre of a ruled surface X. Then C obviously deforms at least locally. Next, let $\tilde{X}$ be the blow-up of X in any point of C and denote by $\tilde{C} = \overset{-1}{\bigcirc}\!\!-\!\!\overset{-1}{\bigcirc}$ the total transform of C. Then $\tilde{C}^2 = 0$ and $\tilde{C}$ is not rigid, as $\operatorname{Ext}^1_X(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{C}}) = \operatorname{Ext}^1_X(\mathcal{O}_C, \mathcal{O}_C) \neq 0$.

Lemma 2.5. *A connected, Jacobi rigid divisor is a rational tree.*

Proof. Let $D = \sum_i c_i C_i$ be the curve decomposition of D, and assume D is connected and Jacobi rigid. By Lemma 2.2, each curve C_i is Jacobi rigid. Thus $1 - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}) = 1 - h^0(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}) + h^1(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}) = 1 - 1 + 0 = 0$, i.e. C_i has arithmetic genus zero and is smooth and rational (see [5, §II.11]).

The divisor $D_{\mathrm{red}} = \sum_i C_i$ of D is reduced by definition, connected by assumption and also has arithmetic genus $1 - \chi(\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathrm{red}}}) = 1 - 1 + 0 = 0$ (note that reduced and connected implies $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{D_{\mathrm{red}}}) = \Bbbk$) and, again by [5, §II.11], a tree of smooth, rational curves. □

Example 2.6. Let $D = \overset{-2}{\bigcirc}\!\!=\!\!\overset{-3}{\bigcirc}$ be a (-2)-curve and (-3)-curve intersecting transversally in two points. Then D is easily seen to be negative definite. However, D is not a tree and, in particular, not Jacobi rigid.

Example 2.7. Consider $D = 2Z + 2A + 2B + 2C =$  where all curves are rational with $A^2 = B^2 = C^2 = -3$ and the central curve $Z^2 = -1$. An easy computation yields that D is negatively closed. Put $D' := D_{\mathrm{red}}$. The decomposition sequence for $D = D' + D'$ shows $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{D'}(-D'))$ because $\mathcal{O}_{D'}$ is rigid and well-connected. The decomposition sequence for $D' = (A + B + C) + Z$, twisted by $-D'$, is

$$\mathcal{O}_{A+B+C}(-Z - D') \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D'}(-D') \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z(-D').$$

Its cohomology sequence ends in $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{D'}(-D')) \twoheadrightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_Z(-D')) = \Bbbk$, because of $Z.(-D') = Z.(-A - B - C - Z) = -2$. Therefore we have $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_{D'}(-D')) \neq 0$, and D is a negatively closed divisor which is a rational tree but not Jacobi rigid.

See also Example 6.14 for a negative definite divisor that is not Jacobi rigid.

2.2. **Properties of 1-decomposable divisors.** The results of this subsection are not used for the numerical curvelike criterion Theorem 3.1, and the reader may jump ahead to Subsection 2.3.

Lemma 2.8. *A 1-decomposable divisor is a tree.*

Proof. Let $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ be a 1-decomposition of D. For a contradiction, assume that $C_{i_1}, \ldots, C_{i_k}$ is a cycle, where $i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k$. Without loss of generality, the curve C_{i_1} does not occur among C_j with $j > i_1$. The inequality $1 = C_{i_1}.(C_{i_1+1} + C_{i_1+2} + \cdots + C_m) \geq C_{i_1}.(C_{i_2} + C_{i_3} + \cdots + C_{i_k}) \geq 2$ is the desired contradiction. □

Lemma 2.9. *If C is a multiple curve in a 1-decomposable divisor D, then $C^2 \leq 0$ with the single exception of $D = 2C$ and $C^2 = 1$.*

Proof. For a 1-decomposition $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$, let $D' \coloneqq C_i + \cdots + C_m$ with i minimal such that $C_i = C$. By assumption, $C \preceq D'$.

Denote by $m \geq 2$ the multiplicity of C in D, so that C has multiplicity $m - 1$ in D'. Next, denote by $v \coloneqq C.(D' - (m-1)C)$ the valency of C in D', i.e. the number of curves in D' (with multiplicities) intersecting C. Then $1 = C.D' = (m-1)C^2 + v$ by the definition of 1-decomposition, hence $C^2 = (1 - v)/(m - 1)$. Thus $C^2 \leq 0$ unless $v = 0$.

However, if $v = 0$ then $C^2 = 1$ and $m = 2$, hence $D' = C$. This enforces $D = 2C$, lest we get a contradiction $1 = C_{i-1}.D_{i-1} = C_{i-1}.2C_i$. □

Proposition 2.10. *A 1-decomposable divisor is 1-connected.*

Proof. The claim holds trivially for the special case of Lemma 2.9 of a double curve of self-intersection 1; so from now we exclude this case and assume $C^2 \leq 0$ for all multiple curves $C \prec D$.

Consider a 1-decomposition $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$. Put $I \coloneqq \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $A_i \coloneqq C_1 + \cdots + C_i$ for $i \in I$. Also set $A_0 \coloneqq 0$. By the definition of 1-decompositions, we have $C_i.(D - A_i) = 1$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{m\}$. For a curve $C \prec D$, we let $\iota(C) \coloneqq \min\{i \in I \mid C_i = C\}$ be the index of the first occurrence of C in the 1-decomposition.

Step 1: $C_i.(D - C_i) = 1 + C_i.A_{i-1} \geq 1$ if $i < m$.

The equality follows from the straightforward computation $C_i.(D - C_i) = C_i.(D - A_i + A_{i-1}) = C_i.(D - A_i) + C_i.A_{i-1} = 1 + C_i.A_{i-1}$.

If $i = \iota(C_i)$ is minimal, i.e. none of $C_1, \ldots, C_{i-1}$ equals C_i, then we have $C_i.A_{i-1} = C_i.(C_1 + \cdots + C_{i-1}) \geq 0$. If $C_j = C_i$ is a repeated curve with $j < m$, then $C_j.A_{j-1} = C_j.(D - C_j) - 1 = C_i.(D - C_i) - 1 = C_i.A_{i-1} \geq 0$.

Step 2: For a subset $L \subsetneq I$ with $m \notin L$, we put $\ell \coloneqq \#L$ and $A_L \coloneqq \sum_{j \in L} C_j$. We can assume $m \notin L$ by replacing A_L with $D - A_L$, if necessary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A_L.(D - A_L) &= \sum_{i \in L} C_i.(D - C_i) - 2\sum_{i<j\in L} C_i.C_j \\ &= \ell + \sum_{i \in L} C_i.A_{i-1} - 2\sum_{i<j\in L} C_i.C_j. \end{aligned}$$

Among the $\binom{\ell}{2}$ choices for elements $i, j \in L$ with $i < j$, at most $\ell - 1$ can lead to $C_i.C_j = 1$ because D is a tree. If $C_i = C_j$, then $C_i.C_j \leq 0$ by Lemma 2.9 and our starting assumption. Denote by $\sigma \coloneqq \sigma(L) < \ell$ the number of transversal crossings in A_L. The right-hand term thus is

$$-2\sum_{i<j\in L} C_i.C_j \geq -2\sigma.$$

Consider $i, j \in L$ with $i < j$ and $C_i.C_j = 1$. Write $\iota i := \iota(C_i)$ and $\iota j := \iota(C_j)$ for the indices of the first occurrences of C_i and C_j in the 1-decomposition, respectively. By $j < m$, Step 1 gives $C_i.A_{i-1} = C_{\iota i}.A_{\iota i-1}$ and $C_j.A_{j-1} = C_{\iota j}.A_{\iota j-1}$. There are two cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota i < \iota j \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad C_j.A_{j-1} \geq C_j.C_i = 1 \\ \iota j < \iota i \quad &\Longrightarrow \quad C_i.A_{i-1} \geq C_i.C_j = 1 \end{aligned}$$

because $C_j.A_{j-1}$ and $C_i.A_{i-1}$ are sums of zeros and ones; the possibly negative terms C_j^2 or C_i^2 do not occur by the order of the respective initial entries.

The summands 1 we collect in this way for each i, j with $C_i.C_j = 1$ add up to $\sum_{i \in L} C_i.A_{i-1} \geq \sigma$.

Step 3: Altogether, we get from $\sigma \leq \ell - 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} A_L.(D - A_L) &= \ell + \sum_{i \in L'} C_i.A_{i-1} - 2\sum_{i<j \in L} C_i.C_j \\ &\geq \ell + \sigma - 2\sigma = \ell - \sigma \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.3. **About divisor properties.** The multitude of divisor properties can be overwhelming. In this short section, we attempt to categorise them.

Definition 2.11. Let (P) be a property of effective divisors. (P) is called

- *closed* if $0 \prec D' \prec D$ and D satisfies (P), then D' satisfies (P);
- *open* if $D \prec D''$ with $\operatorname{supp}(D'') = \operatorname{supp}(D)$ and D'' satisfies (P), then D satisfies (P);
- *numerical* if $D = c_1C_1 + \cdots + c_mC_m$ is the curve decomposition of a divisor satisfying (P) and $D' = c_1C_1' + \cdots + c_mC_m'$ with $C_i.C_j = C_i'.C_j'$ for all i, j, then D' satisfies (P);
- *birational* if it is preserved under contractions and blow-ups;
- *homological* if it only depends on the graded vector space $\operatorname{Ext}_X^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D)$.

Remark 2.12. The topological terminology comes from viewing the set of effective divisors on X as a poset under $\preceq$, and giving it the Alexandrov topology. The notion 'open' only makes sense if, given a divisor D, we restrict to the subspace of divisors supported on D.

Example 2.13. Closed properties are rigid, Jacobi rigid, rigid as subscheme (Lemma 2.2) and negatively closed (by definition).

A property is open and closed if it only depends on the reduced divisor, i.e. the underlying curve configuration. Examples are negative definite (by definition) and rigid on exceptional loci of rational singularities.

Homological properties are well-connected, rigid, curvelike, $(-n)$-divisor and spherelike. A homological property is birational.

Remark 2.14. A property (P) is numerical if it depends on the intersection matrix and the coefficients of the curves making up D (up to permutation). This is weaker than demanding (P) only depends on the numerical class $[D] \in NS(X)$. Equivalently, (P) can be checked on the weighted (by multiplicities) dual intersection graph of D. By Theorem 3.1, the property 'curvelike' is numerical when restricted to rational divisors.

For a naturally occurring property which is numerical, but not birational, see Remark 6.5. By contrast, the next statement shows that all properties introduced in Section 1 are birational.

Proposition 2.15. *These properties of effective divisors are birational: negative definite, negatively closed, negatively filtered, curvelike, $(-n)$-divisor, rigid, rigid as a subscheme, Jacobi rigid, 1-decomposable, 1-connected, well-connected, connected, rational.*

Proof. We can assume that $\pi\colon \tilde{X} \to X$ is the blow-up in a single point, with an effective divisor D on X and its full transform $\tilde{D} = \pi^* D$ on $\tilde{X}$. It is sufficient to show that a property holds for D if and only if it holds for $\pi^* D$.

The claim is obvious for these two properties: connected and rational.

For the homological notions (rigid, well-connected, $(-n$-divisor), curvelike), use that π^* is fully faithful: $\operatorname{Ext}^i(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) = \operatorname{Ext}^i(\pi^*\mathcal{O}_D, \pi^*\mathcal{O}_D) = \operatorname{Ext}^i(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{D}}, \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{D}})$ for all i. Since $\pi^*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}}$, we also find that Jacobi rigidity is birational. By Lemma 1.5, rigidity as a subscheme is thus birational, too.

Now let $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ be a 1-decomposition of D. Write C_i' for the strict transform of C_i. We get a 1-decomposition of $\tilde{D}$ by replacing each C_i with its total transform $\pi^* C_i$, where the exceptional divisor comes first. More explicitly, if the blown-up point is not on C_i, then $\pi^* C_i = C_i'$ is unchanged; if the point is on C_i, then take $\pi^* C_i = E + C_i'$. This is again a 1-decomposition by $E^2 = -1$ and $C_i'^2 = C_i^2 - 1$. Conversely, for a 1-decomposition $\tilde{D} = C_1' + \cdots + C_{m'}'$ can always be rearranged such that E is in front of a curve C_i' with $C_i'.E = 1$ (as the intersection of E with curves untouched by the blowdown is always zero), so we can revert the above process by replacing each C_i' by C_i, and dropping all E.

The same procedure applies to negative filtrations.

Regarding negatively closed divisors, we use some standard facts about the intersection products on X and $\tilde{X}$. For any divisors A, B on X, we have $\pi^* A.\pi^* B = A.B$. This immediately shows that $\tilde{D}$ negatively closed implies D negatively closed. Conversely, for divisors B on X and $\tilde{A}$ on $\tilde{X}$ we have $B.\pi_* \tilde{A} = \pi^* B.\tilde{A}$. If D is negatively closed and $0 \preceq \tilde{A} \preceq \tilde{D}$, then we use that fact with $B \coloneqq \pi_* \tilde{A} \preceq D$, obtaining

$$0 > (\pi_* \tilde{A})^2 = (\pi^* \pi_* \tilde{A}).\tilde{A} = (\tilde{A} + (\tilde{A}.E)E).\tilde{A}) = \tilde{A}^2 + (\tilde{A}.E)^2 \geq \tilde{A}^2,$$

showing that $\tilde{D}$ is negatively closed.

D is negative definite if all multiples kD, with $k > 0$ are negatively closed. Hence the last paragraph also proves that negative definite is birational.

Finally, for 1-connectedness, similar reasoning works as for negatively closed. If $\tilde{D}$ is 1-connected, then D is, too: $A.(D - A) = \pi^* A.\pi^*(D - A) = \tilde{A}.(\tilde{D} - \tilde{A}) \geq 1$. Conversely, if D is 1-connected and $0 \preceq \tilde{A} \preceq \tilde{D}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq \pi_* \tilde{A}.(D - \pi_* \tilde{A}) &= \pi_* \tilde{A}.\pi_*(\tilde{D} - \tilde{A}) = \pi^* \pi_* \tilde{A}.(\tilde{D} - \tilde{A}) \\ &= (\tilde{A} + (\tilde{A}.E)E).(\tilde{D} - \tilde{A}) = \tilde{A}.(\tilde{D} - \tilde{A}) - (\tilde{A}.E)^2, \end{aligned}$$

using $\tilde{D}.E = \pi^* D.E = 0$. Hence $\tilde{A}.(\tilde{D} - \tilde{A}) \geq 1 + (\tilde{A}.E)^2 \geq 1$. □

3. Numerical characterisation of curvelike divisors

In this section, we prove a characterisation of curvelike divisors in terms of intersection numbers. This is useful because it turns a homologically defined notion into something much easier to test in practice. The criterion is about the existence of particularly nice curve decompositions; in examples, this is the easiest way to check that a divisor is curvelike.

For the convenience of the reader, we recall the notions appearing in the theorem: let $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ be a curve decomposition of an effective divisor. The sequence of curves $C_1, \ldots, C_m$ is called a

- 1-*decomposition* if $C_i.(C_{i+1} + \cdots + C_m) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$;
- *negative filtration* if $C_i.(C_i + \cdots + C_m) < 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

Theorem 3.1. *For an effective divisor D these conditions are equivalent:*

(1) D is curvelike, i.e. well-connected and rigid.
(2) D is rational, 1-decomposable and negatively filtered.

Corollary 3.2. *An effective divisor D is a $(-n)$-divisor if and only if D is 1-decomposable and negatively filtered with $D.K_X = n - 2$.*

Proof. This follows from Riemann-Roch: $1 = \chi(\mathcal{O}_D) = -\frac{1}{2}(D^2 + D.K)$. □

Remark 3.3. This corollary works well for computing spherelike examples, where we can check $D.K_X = 0$, which is easier to calculate than D^2.

The conditions 'D rational' and '$D.K = n - 2$' are not numerical in the sense of Definition 2.11. This is unavoidable in view of examples such as a non-rational curve of self-intersection $-n$; see Example 1.6.

There cannot be a purely numerical characterisation of (non-rational) rigid divisors, at least not with the properties of Subsection 2.3. For instance, Example 2.7 contains a rational, negatively closed tree but non-rigid divisor.

Example 3.4. The divisor $D = B + 2C + C' + E =$

such that $B^2 = -3, E^2 = -1$ and $C^2 = C'^2 = -2$ is spherelike, i.e. a (-2)-divisor, by Corollary 3.2: C, B, C', C, E is both a 1-decomposition and a negative filtration, and the conditions $D.K = 0$ or $D^2 = -2$ are easy to check.

The proof of the theorem uses a couple of lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. *A Jacobi rigid, well-connected divisor is 1-connected.*

Proof. Let $0 \prec A \prec D$ and $B := D - A$; we need to show $A.B \geq 1$. Now D is Jacobi rigid, hence A and B are as well, by Lemma 2.2. Thus $H^1(\mathcal{O}_A) = H^1(\mathcal{O}_B) = 0$ and specifically $\chi(\mathcal{O}_A) \geq 1$ and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_B) \geq 1$. About D we know $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = 0$, so $\chi(\mathcal{O}_D) = 1$. By Lemma 1.1,

$$A.B = \chi(\mathcal{O}_A) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_B) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_D) \geq 1 + 1 - 1 = 1.$$ □

Lemma 3.6. *A negatively filtered divisor is rigid as a subscheme.*

Proof. We have to show $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(D)) = 0$ for a divisor D with a negative filtration $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$. We proceed by descending induction on

the number m of curve components. Set $D_i \coloneqq C_i + \cdots + C_m$. From the decomposition sequences for $D_i = D_{i+1} + C_i$, we get triangles

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D_{i+1}}(D_{i+1})) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D_i}(D_i)) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}(D_i)),$$

for $i = m, m-1, \ldots, 1$. With $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{D_{i+1}}(D_{i+1})) = 0$ by induction, it remains to check $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}(D_i)) = 0$. This holds since $\deg_{C_i}(D_i) = C_i.D_i < 0$. □

Part of the next statement is a weaker version of Proposition 2.10. However, the proof below is noticeably simpler.

Lemma 3.7. *If D is a 1-decomposable, rational divisor, then D is well-connected and Jacobi rigid, i.e. $H^0(\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ and $H^1(\mathcal{O}_D) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ be a 1-decomposition with D effective and rational. We show this statement by induction on the number of irreducible components (with multiplicities) m of D. If $m = 1$, then $D = C_1$ is a reduced, irreducible rational curve and thus $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{C_1}) = \Bbbk$, $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{C_1}) = 0$.

For $m > 1$, note that $C_2 + \cdots + C_m$ forms a 1-decomposition of $D - C_1$. We know $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{C_1}(C_1 - D)) = 0$ from $C_1.(C - D_1) = -1$. Now the long exact cohomology sequence of the decomposition $\mathcal{O}_{C_1}(C_1 - D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D-C_1}$ yields $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D-C_1})$. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ be a curve decomposition of a rational divisor. Then $-\sum_i C_i^2 = D.K_X + 2m$.*

Proof. By Riemann–Roch for $C_i \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, we have $C_i^2 + 2 = -C_i.K_X$. Summing these up, we get $\sum C_i^2 + 2m = -D.K_X$. □

Lemma 3.9. *A Jacobi rigid, 1-connected divisor is 1-decomposable.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, a Jacobi rigid and connected divisor is rational.

Given a 1-connected divisor D, we have $C.(D - C) \geq 1$ for all curves C in D. We first claim that there actually is some C with equality. So assuming that $C.(D - C) \geq 2$ throughout, we get an inequality by summing over all curves and invoking Lemma 3.8 and Riemann–Roch:

$$2m \leq \sum_{C \prec D} C.(D-C) = \sum_{C \prec D} C.D - \sum_{C \prec D} C^2 = D^2 + D.K + 2m = -2\chi(\mathcal{O}_D) + 2m.$$

This achieves the desired contradiction, because $\chi(\mathcal{O}_D) = h^0(\mathcal{O}_D) > 0$ from D Jacobi rigid. So there is a curve C_1 such that $C_1.(D - C_1) = 1$.

For the induction step, observe that Jacobi rigidity is passed from D on to $D' = D - C_1$ by Lemma 2.2. The only ingredient missing for the above argument is that D' stays 1-connected. This we prove by a descending induction: assume $D = D' + C_1$ is 1-connected with $C_1.D' = 1$ and let $D' = A + (D' - A)$ with $0 \prec A \prec D'$. Then we can write $D' + C_1$ as a sum of effective subdivisors in two ways: $D' + C_1 = (A + C_1) + (D' - A) = A + (D' - A + C_1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq (A + C_1).(D' - A) &&= A.(D' - A) - C_1.A + C_1.D', \\ 1 &\leq A.(D' - A + C_1) &&= A.(D' - A) + C_1.A. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce $\frac{1}{2} \leq A.(D' - A)$, so that D' is 1-connected, as claimed. □

Remark 3.10. The proof of this lemma also shows that any partial 1-decomposition $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_l + D'$ of a Jacobi rigid, 1-connected divisor can be completed to a 1-decomposition.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. (1) $\implies$ (2): D is curvelike, so by definition well-connected and rigid. Thus D is 1-connected by Lemma 3.5, and rational by Lemma 2.5. Then D has a 1-decomposition by Lemma 3.9.

(2) $\implies$ (1): D is rigid and well-connected by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7. □

4. Minimally curvelike divisors

4.1. **Modifying curvelike divisors: blowup and blowdown.** Consider a blow-up $\pi\colon \tilde{X} \to X$ in a point $P \in X$, with exceptional (-1)-curve E, and let D be a curvelike divisor on X. As $\pi^*\colon \mathcal{D}^b(X) \to \mathcal{D}^b(\tilde{X})$ is fully faithful, $\operatorname{Hom}^\bullet(\pi^*\mathcal{O}_D, \pi^*\mathcal{O}_D) = \operatorname{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D)$. Hence π^*D stays curvelike, and $(\pi^*D)^2 = D^2$.

If $P \notin \operatorname{supp}(D)$, then π^*D is the same curve configuration as D. Otherwise, P lies on curves $C_1, \dots, C_k$ occurring in D (and on no other curves of D) with multiplicities $n_1, \dots, n_k$, respectively. Then the exceptional curve E appears in π^*D with multiplicity $n_1 + \cdots + n_k$, and the intersection number of each C_i drops by $C_i.E$. For posteriority, we record the contraction criterion in the next proposition. In that situation, we say that the curvelike divisor can be blown down.

Proposition 4.1. *Let D be a $(-n)$-divisor on X and $E \prec D$ a (-1)-curve with $E.D = 0$. Let $\pi\colon X \to X'$ be the contraction of E. Then $\pi(D)$ is a $(-n)$-divisor on X'.*

4.2. **Modifying curvelike divisors: twisting spherical divisors.** As explained in the previous section, (-1)-curves can sometimes be removed from a $(-n)$-divisor. There is an analogous construction for (-2)-curves, using spherical twists. We give the definitions first, and then proceed to explain why they make sense.

Definition 4.2. A *spherelike component* of a $(-n)$-divisor D is a spherelike subdivisor $A \prec D$ such that $D - A$ is a $(-n)$-divisor.

A is a *spherical component* of D if it is a spherical divisor and a spherelike component of D. In this case, D is said to be obtained by *twisting A on to $D - A$*; likewise, $D - A$ is said to be obtained by *twisting A off D*.

There is a simple check when a (-2)-curve is a spherelike, and hence spherical, component:

Lemma 4.3. *If D is a $(-n)$-divisor and C a $(-m)$-curve with $m \geq 2$ and $D.C = 1$, then $D + C$ is a $(-n - m + 2)$-divisor.*

In particular, if C is a (-2)-curve, then $D + C$ stays a $(-n)$-divisor.

Proof. This follows from the decomposition sequences

$$\mathcal{O}_C(-D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D+C} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}_D(D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D+C}(D + C) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(D + C)$$

by taking cohomology and using $C.(-D) = -1$ and $C.(D+C) = 1-m \leq -1$, respectively. □

We turn to some easy and general properties of spherelike components:

Lemma 4.4. *Let $A \prec D$ be a spherelike component. Then*

(1) $A.(D-A) = 1$ and $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(A-D)) = 0$,
(2) $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D-A}, \mathcal{O}_A(A-D)) = \Bbbk[-1]$,

Proof. (1) Write $B := D - A$. We deduce $A.B = 1$ from $-n = D^2 = (A+B)^2 = A^2 + 2A.B + B^2 = -2 + 2A.B - n$. For the second claim, consider the cohomology triangle $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B)) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_B)$ of the decomposition sequence, and use $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D) \cong H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_B) \cong \Bbbk$, so the second map is an isomorphism induced by restriction of global sections.

(2) We turn to $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_A(-B))$. For this, apply $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\,\cdot\,, \mathcal{O}_A(-B))$ to $\mathcal{O}(-B) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_B$ and get

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_A(-B)) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B)) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A).$$

The right-hand term is isomorphic to $\Bbbk$, and the middle term vanishes by (1), so the left-hand term is isomorphic to $\Bbbk[-1]$, i.e. $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_A(-B)) = \Bbbk$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_A(-B)) = \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_A(-B)) = 0$. □

Corollary 4.5. *A curvelike divisor consisting of (-2)-curves is spherical.*

Proof. Let D be a curvelike divisor consisting of (-2)-curves only. If D is a single (-2)-curve, then the statement is clear. We proceed inductively using a 1-decomposition of D; see Theorem 3.1. So we can assume that D is spherical and C a (-2)-curve with $C.D = 1$. We only have to show that $\mathcal{O}_{D+C}(K_X) \cong \mathcal{O}_{D+C}$, as $D + C$ is already spherelike by Lemma 4.3.

Tensoring the decomposition sequence for $D + C$ with $\mathcal{O}(K_X)$ yields the exact sequence $\mathcal{O}_C(-D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{D+C}(K_X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D$, as both $\mathcal{O}_D$ and $\mathcal{O}_C(-D)$ are invariant by assumption. By Lemma 4.4(2), $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_C(-D)) \cong \Bbbk$, and this forces $\mathcal{O}_{D+C}(K_X) \cong \mathcal{O}_{D+C}$. □

We justify the terminology of Definition 4.2: spherical components of curvelike divisors can be twisted off, producing a smaller curvelike divisor. We briefly recall the well-known spherical twist functors:

The *twist functor* $\mathsf{T}_F \colon \mathcal{D}^b(X) \to \mathcal{D}^b(X)$ of $F \in \mathcal{D}^b(X)$ is defined on objects A by the triangles $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(F, A) \otimes F \to A \to \mathsf{T}_F(A)$, i.e. $\mathsf{T}_F(A)$ is the cone of the canonical evaluation morphism. See [10, §2.1] for how these cones become functorial in an appropriate setting, e.g. for $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$.

Proposition 4.6 ([12, §8.1], [10, Lem. 3.1])**.** *Given two divisors D, D' with D effective, the functor $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')}$ is an autoequivalence of $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$ if and only if D is spherical. In this case, $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')}$ is called* spherical twist functor*.*

Proposition 4.7. *Let $A \prec D$ be a spherical component. Then*

(1) $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(A-D), \mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$, and
(2) $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_A(A-D)}(\mathcal{O}_D) \cong \mathcal{O}_{D-A}$.

Proof. We apply $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\,\cdot\,, \mathcal{O}_A)$ to $\mathcal{O}(-A) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(B) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D(B)$, obtaining the triangle

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(A)) \leftarrow H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B)) \leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_A(-B)).$$

With the middle term vanishing by Lemma 4.4(1), we plug $\mathcal{O}_A(K) \cong \mathcal{O}_A$ (A is spherical) into Serre duality to deduce $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B), \mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk$ from

$$\Bbbk[-2] \cong H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(A))[-1] \cong \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_A(-B)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B), \mathcal{O}_D)^*.$$

The second part follows now, since twist $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_A(-B)}(\mathcal{O}_D)$ is defined by the triangle

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B), \mathcal{O}_D) \otimes \mathcal{O}_A(-B) \to \mathcal{O}_D \to \mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{O}_A(-B)}(\mathcal{O}_D),$$

which reduces to the short exact sequence $\mathcal{O}_A(-B) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_B$ by the first part. □

4.3. **Curvelike decompositions.**

Definition 4.8. A $(-n)$-divisor D is called a *minimal $(-n)$-divisor* or also *minimally curvelike* if no (-1)-curves can be contracted from D, and no (-2)-curves can be twisted off D, i.e. if
- $D.C \neq 0$ for all (-1)-curves C in D, and
- $D.C \neq -1$ for all (-2)-curves C in D.

Remark 4.9. Any negative reduced curve is minimally curvelike, except for a reduced (-1)-curve, which can be contracted. If a $(-n)$-divisor D can be obtained from a $(-n)$-curve by blow-ups or spherical twists, then D is said to be *essentially a $(-n)$-curve*.

Lemma 4.10. *A curvelike divisor is minimal if and only if no (-1)-curve in D can be contracted and no spherical component can be twisted off.*

Proof. One direction is clear. For the other one, let D be a curvelike divisor without any (-1)-curves that can be blown down, but a spherical component A. We have to show that D is not minimally curvelike, i.e. there is a (-2)-curve that can be twisted off. Assume the contrary, that for all (-2)-curves $C \prec D$ holds $D.C \neq -1$. Therefore, as D is 1-connected, $(D - C).C \geq 2$ for all these curves, or equivalently $D.C \geq 0$. In particular, for the spherical component A — which consists only of (-2)-curves — we find $A.D \geq 0$. This is absurd as $A.D = A^2 + A.(D - A) = -1$. □

The above proof (with $D = A$) also works for the following statement; note that a spherical divisor consists of (-2)-curves only.

Corollary 4.11. *A spherical divisor is essentially a (-2)-curve.*

Definition 4.12. Let D be a curvelike divisor. A *curvelike decomposition* of D is a sum $D = D_1 + \cdots + D_m$ of effective subdivisors with $-2 \geq D_i^2 \geq D^2$ and $D_i.(D_{i+1} + \cdots + D_m) = 1$ for all i.

For a description of curvelike decompositions, we coin a term for the divisors obtained by successively blowing up a $(-n)$-curve:



called *simple $(-n)$-chain*.

Theorem 4.13. *Any curvelike divisor D on X has a curvelike decomposition $D = A_1 + \ldots + A_m$ where each part A_i is the pullback of either a $(-n_i)$-curve or a simple $(-n_i)$-chain, with $-2 \geq -n_i \geq -n$.*

Corollary 4.14. *A minimally curvelike divisor has a non-trivial curvelike decomposition.*

Corollary 4.15. *A (-1)-divisor is essentially a (-1)-curve.*

This theorem follows from the following more precise proposition about the structure of curvelike divisors, whose proof occupies the rest of this subsection.

Proposition 4.16. *Let D be a $(-n)$-divisor on X which is not the pullback of a $(-n)$-curve. Then there is a contraction $\pi\colon X \to Y$ to a smooth surface Y such that $D = \pi^*D'$ has a curvelike decomposition $D' = A + B$ where $A = C_1 + \cdots + C_l$ comes from a 1-decomposition of D' and where A is*

- *either a $(-k)$-curve with $-2 \geq -k \geq -n$ and B a $-(n+2-k)$-divisor,*
- *or a simple $(-n)$-chain and B a (-2)-divisor.*

This proposition yields the curvelike decomposition $D = A_1 + \ldots + A_k$ of Theorem 4.13 by applying it iteratively.

Remark 4.17. Let $D = \pi^*(A + B)$ be a curvelike decomposition with A a simple $(-n)$-chain. In particular, there is a (-1)-curve C in A. As A is built by a 1-decomposition, $C.D = C.A + C.B = 0 + 1 = 1$. In particular, D comes not as a pullback of some divisor from the surface where C is contracted.

Before turning to the proof of Proposition 4.16, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.18. *Let D be a negatively closed divisor with a 1-decomposition $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$. Suppose that for some $l < m$, all $A_i = C_1 + \cdots + C_i$ are reduced trees, where $i = 1 \ldots, l$. Then*

$$A_i^2 + 1 = A_i.D, \quad A_i.(D - A_i) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad -1 \geq A_i^2 \geq D^2 - 1.$$

Proof. We add the 1-decomposition pieces $1 = C_k.(D - C_1 - \cdots - C_k)$ up to $i \leq l$:

$$\begin{aligned} i &= \sum_{k=1}^{i} C_k.(D - C_1 - \cdots - C_k) = \sum_k C_k.D - \sum_{k'<k} C_{k'}.C_k - \sum_k C_k^2 \\ &= A_i.D - A_i^2 + \sum_{k'<k} C_{k'}.C_k = A_i.D - A_i^2 + i - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the final sum expands to $i - 1$ because A_i is a reduced tree with i vertices. This implies the first formula. The second one is obtained by plugging $D = (D - A_i) + A_i$ into the first one. From this, we get

$$0 > (D - A_i)^2 = D.(D - A_i) - A_i.(D - A_i) = D^2 - D.A_i - 1 = D^2 - A_i^2 - 2$$

as D is negatively closed. For the same reason also $A_i^2 < 0$ and, combining these two, the last statement follows. □

Proof of Proposition 4.16. Without loss of generality, we may assume that there are no (-1)-curves C in D that can be blown-down, i.e. $D.C = 0$. Let $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ be a 1-decomposition of a $(-n)$-divisor D and set $A_i := C_1 + \cdots + C_i$ and $B_i := D - A_i$, so that $C_i.B_i = 1$. From Lemma 4.18, we know $-1 \geq C_1^2 = A_1^2 \geq D^2 - 1 = -n - 1$. There are three cases:

- $C_1^2 = -1$ is excluded, since we can contract it (as $D.C_1 = 0$);
- $-2 \geq C_1^2 \geq -n$, and $D = C_1 + (D - C_1)$ forms a curvelike decomposition, so we are done;

• $C_1^2 = -n-1$, and then $A_1.B_1 = 1$ and $B_1^2 = -1$.

So, we only have to deal with the last case, where a simple $(-n)$-chain will be constructed inductively. By Remark 3.10, we may assume in the following that there is no (-2)-curve C in D with $C.(D-C) = 1$. As a side remark, such a curve could be twisted off.

For the induction step, assume that for some i we have: $A_i^2 = -n-1$ and $B_i^2 = -1$ and $A_i.B_i = 1$ and moreover that A_i contains no (-1)-curves. First note that from D negative closed we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > (B_i - C_{i+1})^2 &= B_i.(B_i - C_{i+1}) - C_{i+1}.(B_i - C_{i+1}) \\ &= B_i^2 - B_i.C_{i+1} - 1 = -2 - B_i.C_{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

using also the 1-decomposition and $B_i^2 = -1$. So this implies $B_i.C_{i+1} \geq -1$. Combining it again with $1 = C_{i+1}.(B_i - C_{i+1})$ from the 1-decomposition, we get $C_{i+1}^2 \in \{-1, -2\}$.

Next, we will show $A_i.C_{i+1} \in \{0, 1\}$. To see this note that by the 1-decomposition and the induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \qquad A_{i+1}.B_{i+1} &= (A_i + C_{i+1}).(B_i - C_{i+1}) \\ &= A_i.B_i - A_i.C_{i+1} + C_{i+1}.B_{i+1} = 2 - A_i.C_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with 1-connectedness, we get $1 \leq A_{i+1}.B_{i+1} = 2 - A_i.C_{i+1}$, so $A_i.C_{i+1} \leq 1$.

As $1 = C_{i+1}.B_{i+1} = C_{i+1}.(B_i - C_{i+1})$ we conclude that $B_i.C_{i+1} = -1$. On the other hand, $D.C_{i+1} = (D - C_{i+1}).C_{i+1} + C_{i+1}^2 \geq 1 - 2 = -1$ because D is 1-connected. Therefore $A_i.C_{i+1} = D.C_{i+1} - B_i.C_{i+1} \geq -1 + 1 = 0$.

Case 1: $A_i.C_{i+1} = 0$. Then we compute

$$D.C_{i+1} = B_i.C_{i+1} = B_{i+1}.C_{i+1} + C_{i+1}^2 = 1 + C_{i+1}^2.$$

So we can contract C_{i+1} if $C_{i+1}^2 = -1$, otherwise $C_{i+1}.(D - C_{i+1}) = 1$ if $C_{i+1}^2 = -2$, both we have excluded.

Case 2: $A_i.C_{i+1} = 1$. If $i+1 = m$, then $D.C_m = A_{m-1}.C_m + C_m^2 = 1 + C_m^2$, leading to the same values and therefore excluded cases as before.

So $i + 1 < m$ and we distinguish the following two subcases.

Subcase 2.1: $C_{i+1}^2 = -1$. As we have here $A_{i+1}^2 = -n$ and $A_{i+1}.B_{i+1} = 1$ from $(*)$, we get a curvelike decomposition $D = A_{i+1} + B_{i+1}$.

Subcase 2.2: $C_{i+1}^2 = -2$. Then $A_{i+1}^2 = -n-1$, $A_{i+1}.B_{i+1} = 1$ and therefore $B_{i+1}^2 = -1$. As A_{i+1} does not contain (-1)-curves either, we can start the whole argument with $i \mapsto i + 1$.

So we will end at some point in the *Subcase 2.1* with $A = C_1 + \cdots + C_l$ where

$$\begin{gathered} C_1^2 = -n-1, \quad C_2^2 = \cdots = C_{l-1}^2 = -2, \quad C_l^2 = -1, \quad \text{and} \\ (C_1 + \cdots + C_i).C_{i+1} = 1 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < l. \end{gathered}$$

We will construct a subdivisor A of A_l which is the desired simple $(-n)$-chain. By the second property there is a unique i_1 such that $C_l.C_{i_1} = 1$. Likewise, as $C_{i_1}.(C_1 + \cdots + C_{i_1 - 1}) = 1$ there is a minimal index i_2 such that $C_{i_1}.C_{i_2} = 1$. Proceed inductively until we reach $C_{i_{j+1}} = C_1$. We claim that $A = C_1 + C_{i_j} + \cdots + C_{i_1} + C_l$ gives the desired decomposition $D = A + (D - A)$.

By the (minimal) choice of the indices, A is indeed a reduced chain. Next we see that $C_{i_j}.(D-C_1-C_{i_j}) = C_{i_j}.(C_2+\cdots+C_{i_j-1})+C_{i_j}.(C_{i_j+1}+\cdots+C_m)$. By minimality the first summand is 0, whereas the second summand is 1 by the 1-decomposition. The same holds for the remaining intersection numbers. Therefore $D = A + (D - A)$ is a curvelike decomposition, and by Remark 3.10 A comes from a 1-decomposition of D. □

4.4. **Cohomology of curvelike divisors.** In the two subsequent subsections, we give applications of Theorem 4.13. Here, we provide yet another justification for the terminology 'curvelike': the cohomology groups of $(-n)$-divisors are the same as for a $(-n)$-curve.

Proposition 4.19. *Let D be a $(-n)$-divisor. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}) \cong \Bbbk^{n+1}[-2], && H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(K)) \cong \Bbbk^{n+1}, \\ &\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O}) \cong \Bbbk[-1], && H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D+K) \cong \Bbbk[-1]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The claims about $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(K))$ and $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D+K))$ follow from their left-hand counterparts by Serre duality. Moreover, the statement about $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O})$ follows from one for $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O})$. To see this, apply $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \cdot\,)$ to $\mathcal{O} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}(D) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_D(D)$ and get the triangle

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O}) \to \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}) \to \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D).$$

By definition of D to be a $(-n)$-divisor, $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D) \cong \Bbbk \oplus \Bbbk^{n+1}[-2]$, which implies $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O}) = \Bbbk[-1]$ if and only if $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}) = \Bbbk^{n+1}[-2]$.

To show $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O}) \cong \Bbbk[-1]$, we may assume that D is not the pullback of a smaller $(-n)$-divisor. By Proposition 4.16 there is a decomposition $D = A + B$ where A is either a $(-m)$-curve with $-2 \geq m \geq n$ or $A =$

. We claim that in the triangle

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B(B), \mathcal{O}) \leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O}) \leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(D), \mathcal{O})$$

the right-hand term vanishes, so that the remaining isomorphism allows the reduction to a divisor D' which is the pullback of a $(-n')$-curve C. But then

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D(D), \mathcal{O}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D'}(D'), \mathcal{O}) \cong H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_C(C+K))^*[-2] \cong \Bbbk[-1],$$

using Serre duality and $C.(C + K) = -2$. It remains to show the vanishing of $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(D), \mathcal{O})$ or of $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(D + K))$ by Serre duality. If A is just a curve, then the vanishing follows from $A.(D+K) = A^2+A.B-A^2-2 = -1$.

Otherwise, let $E = C_l$ be the single (-1)-curve in A and $\pi\colon X \to Y$ the contraction of E. Then $A.E = 0$, and hence $A = \pi^*A'$ for some shorter chain $A' =$ 

. Moreover, we have $B.E = 1$, as it came from a 1-decomposition of D, i.e. $D.E = 1$. Therefore, $D = \pi^*D' - E$. Finally, $K_X = \pi^*K_Y + E$. Putting all this together, we find $\mathcal{O}_A(D + K) = \pi^*\mathcal{O}_{A'}(D' + K)$.

Let E' be the (-1)-curve in A' whose strict transform becomes the last (-2)-curve $C = C_{l-1}$ in A. Again we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} E'.D' &= \pi^*E'.\pi^*D' = (C + E).(D + E) = C.D + 1 \\ &= C_l.(C_1 + \cdots + C_{l-1}) + C_l^2 + C_l.(C_{l+1} + \cdots + C_m) + 1 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

as the first and the third summand are equal to 1. This allows us to proceed inductively, until we contract A to a single $(-n)$-curve. □

4.5. **Simple chains as spherelike components.** The following result complements Proposition 4.7.

Proposition 4.20. *Let D be a curvelike divisor with a spherelike component $A = \textcircled{-3}\text{—}\textcircled{-2}\text{—}\cdots\text{—}\textcircled{-2}\text{—}\textcircled{-1}$. Then $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(A-D),\mathcal{O}_D) = \Bbbk \oplus \Bbbk[-1] \oplus \Bbbk[-2]$, and A cannot be twisted off D.*

Before we go for the proof, we need a lemma extending Proposition 4.7(1).

Lemma 4.21. *Let D be a curvelike divisor with a spherelike component A, and denote $B = D - A$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\mathcal{O}_D) \cong \Bbbk \oplus H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B))^*[-2] \cong \begin{cases} \textit{either } \Bbbk \textit{ or} \\ \Bbbk \oplus \Bbbk[-1] \oplus \Bbbk[-2]. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Applying $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\,\cdot\,)$ to the ideal sequence of D yields the triangle

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(A),\mathcal{O}) \to \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\mathcal{O}) \to \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\mathcal{O}_D).$$

By Proposition 4.19, the left-hand term is isomorphic to $\Bbbk[-1]$. Using Serre duality, the middle term is isomorphic to $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B))^*[-2]$. Combining these facts yields the first claimed equivalence, as $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\mathcal{O}_D) \neq 0$.

For the second equivalence of the statement, apply $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\,\cdot\,,\mathcal{O}_D)$ to the decomposition sequence for $A + B$:

$$\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\mathcal{O}_D) \leftarrow H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_D) \leftarrow \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_B,\mathcal{O}_D) :$$

Therefore $\Bbbk \cong \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_D) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_A(-B),\mathcal{O}_D)$. This completes the proof, because $\chi(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B)) = 0$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.20. Set $B \coloneqq D - A$. By Lemma 4.21, we show instead that $H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B)) \neq 0$. Fix a 1-decomposition $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$, and denote $D_i \coloneqq C_1 + \cdots + C_i$ such that $A = D_l$.

Since we assume that $D = A + B$ is like in Proposition 4.16, so $\mathcal{O}_A(K - B) = \mathcal{O}_{D_l}(K - D + D_l)$. We proceed now inductively on D_i until we reach $i = l$.

Step $i = 1$: Since C_1 is a (-3)-curve, we have $C_1.K = 1$, and by the 1-decomposition $C_1.(D - C_1) = 1$:

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{C_1}(K - D + C_1)) \cong H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{C_1}) \cong \Bbbk.$$

Step $1 < i < l$: We use the decomposition sequence for $(D_{i-1}) + C_i$ tensored with $\mathcal{O}(K - D + D_i)$:

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D_{i-1}}(K-D+D_{i-1})) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D_i}(K-D+D_i)) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{C_i}(K-D+D_i)).$$

By the induction hypothesis, the left-hand term is isomorphic to $\Bbbk$. Here, $C_i.K = 0$ as C_i is a (-2)-curve, but still $C_i.(C_{i+1} + \cdots + C_m) = 1$ by the 1-decomposition. Therefore, the right-hand term vanishes and the middle one is isomorphic to $\Bbbk$.

Step $i = l$: We look at the same triangle of cohomology spaces as in the previous step for $i = l$. The left-hand term is still isomorphic to $\Bbbk$. But

$C_l.K = -1$ as C_l is a (-1)-curve, so the right-hand term is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-2) \cong \Bbbk[-1]$. From this follows that the middle term is

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B)) = H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D_l}(K-D+D_l)) = \Bbbk \oplus \Bbbk[-1]$$

as claimed. □

5. Spherelike divisors

Exceptional divisors, i.e. (-1)-divisors, can always be dismantled to (-1)-curves by way of contractions and spherical twists; see Corollary 4.15. In this section, we look at spherelike divisors, i.e. (-2)-divisors.

We start with a simple observation: an easy way for checking that a divisor D is spherelike is via the numerical criterion Corollary 3.2, specifying a 1-decomposition and a negative filtration, and testing $D.K_X = 0$. And by Lemma 3.8, $D.K_X = 0$ if and only if the average of self-intersection numbers of all curve components is -2.

If D is a spherelike divisor with a curvelike decomposition $D = A + B$ (Definition 4.12), then A and B are spherelike divisors themselves, and we emphasise this by calling $D = A + B$ a *spherelike decomposition*.

5.1. **Spherical subcategories.** We recall some notions from [10, §4]. Let D be a spherelike divisor and D' any other divisor. Then by Serre duality

$$\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D(D'), \mathcal{O}_D(D'+K_X)) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D)^* \cong \Bbbk.$$

Therefore, we have a non-zero map, unique up to scalars, which can be completed to the *asphericity triangle*

$$\mathcal{O}_D(D') \to \mathcal{O}_D(D'+K_X) \to Q_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')},$$

whose last term $Q_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')}$ we call the *asphericity* of $\mathcal{O}_D(D')$.

Definition 5.1. Let D be a spherelike divisor and D' an arbitrary divisor. The *spherical subcategory* of the spherelike object $\mathcal{O}_D(D')$ is

$$\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')} \coloneqq {}^\perp Q_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')} = \{M \in \mathcal{D}^b(X) \mid \operatorname{Hom}^\bullet(M, Q_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')}) = 0\}.$$

Proposition 5.2 ([10, Thm. 4.4 & 4.6])**.** *Let D and D' be divisors on X, with D spherelike. Then $\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D(D')}$ is the unique maximal full triangulated subcategory of $\mathcal{D}^b(X)$ containing $\mathcal{O}_D(D')$ as a spherical object.*

Lemma 5.3 ([10, Prop. 5.2])**.** *Let D be a spherelike divisor on X and $\pi\colon X' \to X$ a blow-up in a point $P \in X$. Moreover, let denote $D' = \pi^*D$ and E the exceptional divisor. Then*

$$\mathcal{D}^b(X')_{\mathcal{O}_{D'}} = \begin{cases} \pi^*(\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D}) & \text{if } P \in \operatorname{supp} D, \\ \langle \mathcal{O}_E(-1), \pi^*(\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D}) \rangle & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.7 and [11, Lem. 2.2] together imply the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let D be a spherelike divisor. If $A \prec D$ is a spherical component, then $\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D} = \mathsf{T}^{-1}_{\mathcal{O}_A(-B)}(\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_B})$.*

Both lemmas combine to the following proposition. For the proof we want to note that only blow-ups in points in the support of the essentially spherical divisor have to be considered.

Proposition 5.5. *If D is an essentially spherical divisor on X, then there is a surface X' such that $\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D} \cong \mathcal{D}^b(X')$.*

More precisely, X' is obtained from X by a contraction, the embedding $\iota\colon \mathcal{D}^b(X') \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(X)$ is a composition of spherical twists and pullback functors, and $\mathcal{O}_D = \iota(\mathcal{O}_{D'})$ for a spherical divisor D' on X'.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $D = A + B$ be a spherelike decomposition. Then the asphericity of $\mathcal{O}_D$ occurs in a triangle $R_A \to Q_{\mathcal{O}_D} \to R_B$ where*

$$R_A = \begin{cases} Q_{\mathcal{O}_A(-B)}, & \text{if } H^0(\mathcal{O}_B(D)) = 0 \\ \mathcal{O}_A(K-B) \oplus \mathcal{O}_A(-B)[1], & \text{if } H^0(\mathcal{O}_B(D)) = \Bbbk \end{cases}$$

$$R_B = \begin{cases} Q_{\mathcal{O}_B}, & \text{if } H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B)) = 0 \\ \mathcal{O}_B(K) \oplus \mathcal{O}_B[1], & \text{if } H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B)) = \Bbbk \end{cases}$$

Proof. We recall that $Q_{\mathcal{O}_D}$ is computed as the cone of the canonical map $\mathcal{O}_D \xrightarrow{\omega} \mathcal{O}_D(K)$. Using the decomposition sequence for $D = A + B$ and its $\mathcal{O}(K)$-twist, we get two triangles linked by ω:

$$(*) \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{O}_A(-B) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{O}_D & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{O}_B \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \omega} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} \\ \mathcal{O}_A(K-B) & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & \mathcal{O}_D(K) & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & \mathcal{O}_B(K) \end{array}$$

We already know $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_A(-B), \mathcal{O}_B(K)) = \operatorname{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_A(-B))^* = 0$ from Lemma 4.4(2) and Serre duality; in particular $\pi'\omega\iota = 0$ and this implies that ω extends to a map of triangles. In fact, $\operatorname{Ext}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_A(-B), \mathcal{O}_B(K)) = 0$ ensures that ω determines the resulting morphisms α and β uniquely. Taking cones, $R_A = \operatorname{cone}(\alpha)$ and $R_B = \operatorname{cone}(\beta)$, we get a triangle $R_A \to Q_{\mathcal{O}_D} \to R_B$. However, there are various cases, depending on whether $\alpha \neq 0$ or $\beta \neq 0$.

If $\alpha \neq 0$, then this morphism is a multiple of $\omega_{\mathcal{O}_A(-B)}$, and hence its cone is $R_A = Q_{\mathcal{O}_A(-B)} = Q_{\mathcal{O}_A}(-B)$. On the other hand, if $\alpha = 0$, then the triangle is split and R_A is the direct sum given in the statement of the proposition. The same reasoning applies to β and R_B. We now look at R_A:

$$\alpha = 0 \iff \iota'\alpha = \omega\iota = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\iff \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_D(K)) \neq 0 \tag{2}$$

$$\iff H^1(\mathcal{O}_B(D)) \neq 0 \tag{3}$$

$$\iff H^0(\mathcal{O}_B(D)) = \Bbbk \tag{4}$$

On (1): ι' is injective, and the left-hand square of $(*)$ commutes.

On (2): apply $\operatorname{Hom}(\,\cdot\,, \mathcal{O}_D(K))$ to the top triangle of $(*)$ to get

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_D(K)) \to \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D(K)) \xrightarrow{\iota^*} \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_A(-B), \mathcal{O}_D(K)).$$

If $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_D(K)) = 0$, then ι^* is injective, mapping $\omega \mapsto \omega\iota = \iota'\alpha \neq 0$. On the other hand, if $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B, \mathcal{O}_D(K)) \neq 0$, then $\iota^* = 0$ because we have $\operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D(K)) = \operatorname{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D, \mathcal{O}_D)^* = \Bbbk$.

On (3): applying $\mathrm{Hom}(\,\cdot\,,\mathcal{O}_B)$ to $\mathcal{O}(-D)\hookrightarrow\mathcal{O}\twoheadrightarrow\mathcal{O}_D$ yields the following snippet of the long exact sequence, proving $H^1(\mathcal{O}_B(D))\cong\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B,\mathcal{O}_D(K))$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}_B) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}(-D),\mathcal{O}_B) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_B) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}_B)\\
\| & & \| & & \| & & \|\\
0=H^1(\mathcal{O}_B) & \longrightarrow & H^1(\mathcal{O}_B(D)) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B,\mathcal{O}_D(K))^* & \longrightarrow & H^2(\mathcal{O}_B)=0
\end{array}$$

On (4): By Riemann–Roch, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_B(D))=\frac{1}{2}(B^2+B.K)+B.D=-\frac{2}{2}+1=0$, so $H^0(\mathcal{O}_B(D))\cong H^1(\mathcal{O}_B(D))\cong\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_B,\mathcal{O}_D(K))$.

Now we look at the other cone R_B:

(1') $\qquad \beta=0 \iff \beta\pi=\pi'\omega=0$

(2') $\qquad \iff \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_A(K-B))\neq 0$

(3') $\qquad \iff H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(K-B))=\Bbbk$

On (1'): π is surjective, and the right-hand square of $(*)$ commutes.
On (2'): apply $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\,\cdot\,)$ to the bottom triangle of $(*)$ and get

$$0\to\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_A(K-B))\to\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_D(K))\xrightarrow{\pi'_*}\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_B(K)).$$

π'_* is injective $\iff$ $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_A(K-B))=0$, as $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_D,\mathcal{O}_D(K))=\Bbbk$.
On (3'): this is Serre duality applied to Lemma 4.21. □

Remark 5.7. Let D be spherelike and consider its asphericity triangle $\mathcal{O}_D\to\mathcal{O}_D(K)\to Q$. Taking cohomology and combining it with Proposition 4.19 yields $H^\bullet(Q)=\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{O},Q)=0$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_X\in\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{\mathcal{O}_D}$.

Example 5.8. Let $D=2B+C+C'+E+E'=$ 

such that $B^2=-3, C^2=C'^2=-2, E^2=E'^2=-1$ and D is rational.

D is spherelike by Corollary 3.2: a negative filtration is B,C,C',B,E,E', a 1-decomposition is B,C,C',E,E',B (only crucial that B comes first and last or next-to-last), and finally $D.K=0$ is immediate.

The algorithm proving Proposition 4.16 produces a spherelike decomposition out of a given 1-decomposition. The 1-decomposition B,C,C',E,E',B from above yields $D=(B+C+C'+E)+(B+E')$. Starting with the 1-decomposition B,C,E,C',E',B, we get $D=(B+C+E)+(B+C'+E')$.

Because of $E.D=E'.D=1\neq 0$, neither (-1)-curve can be contracted to yield a smaller spherelike divisor; see Subsection 4.1. Similarly, $C.D=C'.D=0\neq 1$ means that neither of the (-2)-curves can be twisted off D; see Subsection 4.2. Therefore, D is a minimally spherelike divisor.

About the asphericity of D: we employ the criterion of Proposition 5.6 with the spherelike decomposition $D=A+A'$ with $A=B+C+C'+E$ and $A'=B+E'$. So we have to compute $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{A'}(D))$ and $H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(K-A'))$. For the former, the $\mathcal{O}(D)$-twisted decomposition sequence of $A'=B+E'$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{E'}(D-B) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{A'}(D) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_B(D) & \longrightarrow & 0\\
 & & \| & & & & \| & & \\
 & & \mathcal{O}_{E'} & & & & \mathcal{O}_B(-2) & &
\end{array}$$

yields $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{A'}(D))=\Bbbk$. Thus the map $\alpha\colon\mathcal{O}_A(-A')\to\mathcal{O}_A(K-A')$ is zero, and hence $R_A=\mathcal{O}_A(-A')[1]\oplus\mathcal{O}_A(K-A')$. In order to calculate

$H^0(\mathcal{O}_A(K-A'))$, we use the decomposition sequence for $A=(C+C'+E)+B$ and note that $C+C'+E$ is a disjoint union:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{C'}(-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_E(-1)\to\mathcal{O}_D\to\mathcal{O}_B\to 0,$$

and twist it by $\mathcal{O}(K-A')$:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(-2)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{C'}(-2)\oplus\mathcal{O}_E\to\mathcal{O}_D(K-A')\to\mathcal{O}_B\to 0,$$

using $K.C=0, K.E=-1, K.B=1$ and $A'.C=A'.E=A'.B=1$. We find $0\neq H^0(\mathcal{O}_D(K-A'))$, and therefore $\beta\colon \mathcal{O}_{A'}\to\mathcal{O}_{A'}(K)$ is also zero, forcing $R_{A'}=\mathcal{O}_{A'}[1]\oplus\mathcal{O}_{A'}(K)$. The asphericity of $\mathcal{O}_D$ thus sits in the triangle

$$\mathcal{O}_A(-A')[1]\oplus\mathcal{O}_A(K-A')\to Q_{\mathcal{O}_D}\to\mathcal{O}_{A'}[1]\oplus\mathcal{O}_{A'}(K).$$

We take the cohomology exact sequence of this triangle:

$$0\to\mathcal{O}_A(-A')\to h^{-1}(Q_D)\to\mathcal{O}_{A'}\xrightarrow{\bar\omega}\mathcal{O}_A(K-A')\to h^0(Q_D)\to\mathcal{O}_{A'}(K)\to 0.$$

The map $\bar\omega$ really is induced from $\omega\colon\mathcal{O}_D\to\mathcal{O}_D(K)$, again by $\alpha=0$ and $\beta=0$. The only common component of A and A' is the (-3)-curve B, so ω must be nontrivial there. We have $B.(K-A')=B.K-B.(B+E')=1-(-3+1)=3$. Now $\hom(\mathcal{O}_B,\mathcal{O}_B(3))=4$, but ω has to vanish on the intersections of B with the other curves in A ($C.(K-A')=C'.(K-A')=-2, E.(K-A')=0$, so no poles allowed). Prescribing these three zeroes, there is a unique map $\mathcal{O}_B\to\mathcal{O}_B(3)$. Splitting the above long exact sequence into short exact sequences, we get:

$$(a)\qquad 0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_A(-A')\longrightarrow h^{-1}(Q_D)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{E'}(-B)\longrightarrow 0$$

$$(b)\qquad 0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{E'}(-B)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{A'}\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_B\longrightarrow 0$$

$$(x)\qquad 0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_B(-C-C'-E)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_A\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{C+C'+E}\longrightarrow 0$$

$$(c)\qquad 0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_B\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_A(K-A')\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{C+C'+E}(K-A')\longrightarrow 0$$

$$(d)\qquad 0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{C+C'+E}(K-A')\longrightarrow h^0(Q_D)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{A'}(K)\longrightarrow 0$$

Here (a)–(b)–(c)–(d) splice to give the long exact sequence. (b) and (x) are decomposition sequences. (c) is (x) twisted by $K-A'$, using $B.(A'-K)=-3$ for $\mathcal{O}_B(-C-C'-E)=\mathcal{O}_B(-3)=\mathcal{O}_B(A'-K)$. The last term of (c) is

$$\mathcal{O}_{C+E+E'}(K-A')=(\mathcal{O}_C\oplus\mathcal{O}_E\oplus\mathcal{O}_{E'})(K-A')=\mathcal{O}_C(-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}_E(-2)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{E'}(-2).$$

The two further twisted decomposition sequences

$$0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_A(-A')\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{B+C+C'+E+E'}(-B)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{E'}(-B)\longrightarrow 0$$

$$0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{C+C'+E}(K-A')\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{B+C+C'+E+E'}(K)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_{A'}(K)\longrightarrow 0$$

show

$$h^{-1}(Q_D)=\mathcal{O}_{B+C+C'+E+E'}(-B),$$
$$h^0(Q_D)=\mathcal{O}_{B+C+C'+E+E'}(K).$$

The degrees of these line bundles on $B+C+C'+E+E'$ differ. At this point, it seems hard to compute the spherical subcategory $\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{Q_D}={}^\perp Q_D$ explicity. We do know $Q_D,\mathcal{O}_X\in\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{Q_D}$ and ${}^\perp h^{-1}(Q_D)\cap{}^\perp h^0(Q_D)\subseteq\mathcal{D}^b(X)_{Q_D}$.

6. Negative definite divisors and rational singularities

We recall a few facts about surface singularities, as can be found in [1, 2, 5, 3]. For modern proofs of the contraction results, see [15, §A.7 and §4.15f].

Definition 6.1. A normal surface Y is called a *rational singularity* if there is a resolution of singularities $\pi\colon X \to Y$ such that $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y$, i.e. π has connected and acyclic fibres ($R^i\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X = 0$ for $i > 0$).

Proposition 6.2 ([1, Thm. 2.3])**.** *Let D be a reduced, connected divisor on an algebraic surface X. Then D can be contracted to a point P on an algebraic surface Y if and only if D is negative definite, and all effective divisors supported on D are Jacobi rigid.*

If this holds, then P is a rational singularity.

Remark 6.3. The original phrasing of the second condition had $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{D'}) \geq 1$ for all D' supported on D, instead of $H^1(\mathcal{O}_{D'}) = 0$ (Jacobi rigid). Moreover, $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{D'}(D'))$ vanishes for such divisors, too. To see this, note that such D' is negative definite as well, in particular can be negatively filtered, so $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{D'}(D')) = 0$ by Lemma 3.6. Hence any effective divisor supported on a configuration yielding a rational singularity is automatically rigid.

There is a related result stating that D is contractible in the analytic category if and only if D is negative definite, see [8].

Definition 6.4. Let $\pi\colon X \to Y$ be a resolution of the normal surface singularity $P \in Y$. So the exceptional locus $\pi^{-1}(P) = \cup_i C_i$ is a union of projective curves. The *numerical (fundamental) cycle* is the minimal divisor $Z_{\text{num}} = \sum z_i C_i$ such that $z_i > 0$ and $Z_{\text{num}}.C_i \leq 0$ for all i.

Remark 6.5. The condition defining numerical cycles makes sense for arbitrary divisors D, viz. $C.D \leq 0$ for all curves $C \preceq D$. This property is obviously numerical in the sense of Definition 2.11. One can check that the property is birational, because D allows contraction of a (-1)-curve $E \prec D$ if and only if $E.D = 0$.

Now consider the stronger variant $C.D < 0$ for all curves $C \preceq D$. It is also numerical but certainly not birational: a reduced (-1)-curve satisfies the condition, but the blow-up ①—② does not. We remark that this property forces D to be negative definite: let M the intersection matrix of D_{red}; then the intersection matrix of D is TMT where T is the diagonal matrix of curve coefficients of D. By $C.D < 0$, all column sums of TMT are negative, i.e. $-TMT$ is a symmetric, strictly diagonally dominant matrix with positive diagonal entries, hence positive definite [16, Cor. 1.22].

Remark 6.6. It is possible that the dual graph of a resolution of a normal surface singularity is not a tree. A singularity is called *arborescent* if some resolution produces a tree (this property then holds for any good resolution); see [7, §4]. Rational singularities have this property, see e.g. Proposition 6.8.

Definition 6.7. A rational singularity Y is called an *ADE singularity* if there exists a crepant resolution of singularities $\pi\colon X \to Y$, i.e. $K_X = \pi^* K_Y$.

This definition is anachronistic, but the most convenient one for us. As is well-known, there are many characterisations of these singularities, leading

to a lot of equivalent terminology, such as rational double point, simple surface singularity, and they are often named afer du Val or Klein; see [6].

Proposition 6.8. *If $X \to Y$ is a resolution of a rational singularity, then Z_{num} is curvelike. In particular, Z_{num} is spherelike if and only if Y is an ADE singularity.*

Proof. As noted in Remark 6.3, any effective divisor supported on the exceptional locus is rigid. Especially this holds for Z_{num}. Moreover by [15, Prop. 4.12], $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{Z_{\mathrm{num}}}) = 1$, so Z_{num} is well-connected.

If Y is an ADE singularity, then $Z_{\mathrm{num}}^2 = -2$, i.e. Z_{num} is spherelike. The converse implication holds by [3, Thm. 3.31]. □

Corollary 6.9. *Let $X \to Y$ be a crepant resolution of an ADE singularity. Then Z_{num} is spherical. Moreover, the subcategory $\mathcal{D}^b_{Z_{\mathrm{num}}}(X)$ of objects set-theoretically supported on Z_{num} is a 2-Calabi–Yau category.*

Proof. We already know that Z_{num} is spherelike. The singular surface Y is Gorenstein and the resolution is crepant, therefore there is an open subset $U \subset X$ containing the exceptional locus such that $\omega_X|_U \cong \mathcal{O}_U$. In particular, $\omega_X|_{Z_{\mathrm{num}}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{Z_{\mathrm{num}}}$. This shows Z_{num} is spherical, and also that $M \otimes \omega_X \cong M$ for any M supported on Z_{num}. Hence $\mathcal{D}^b_{Z_{\mathrm{num}}}(X)$ has Serre functor $- \otimes \omega_X[2] = [2]$, i.e. is a 2-Calabi–Yau category. □

Example 6.10.  is the numerical cycle of a D_4-singularity, it is a non-reduced spherical divisor. See [5, p. 96] for the complete list of the numerical cycles for the ADE singularities.

Example 6.11. Let T be a tree of (-2)-curves. As a reduced divisor, T is spherical by Corollary 4.11. If T forms an ADE graph, then there is a unique maximal spherical divisor on T, the numerical cycle Z_{num} of Definition 6.4.

The reverse implication holds true as well: if T is not an ADE graph, there is no maximal spherical divisor. For example, consider the following two spherical divisors on a $\tilde{D}_4$-configuration of (-2)-curves:

$D_1 =$  and $D_2 =$ 

The smallest divisor D with $D_1 \preceq D$ and $D_2 \preceq D$ has $D^2 = 0$.

Proposition 6.12. *Let D be a negative definite, curvelike divisor that can be contracted. Then $D \preceq Z_{\mathrm{num}}$. In particular if D contracts to a rational singularity, the Z_{num} is the maximal curvelike divisor with support* $\operatorname{supp} D$.

The proof uses that the numerical cycle can be computed by Laufer's algorithm, and one can see a 1-decomposition as a special case of it.

Proof. By [13, Prop. 4.1], the numerical cycle can be computed recursively: Start with $Z_0 := C$ for some curve $C \prec D$. Given Z_i, compute $Z_i.C'$ for all curves $C' \prec D$. If $Z_i.C' > 0$ for some C', set $Z_{i+1} := Z_i + C'$; else $Z_i.C' \leq 0$ for all C', and then $Z_{\mathrm{num}} = Z_i$.

Using a 1-decomposition of $D = C_1 + \cdots + C_m$ backwards, this algorithm yields $Z_i = C_{m-i} + \cdots + C_m$. In particular, $D = Z_{m-1} \leq Z_{\mathrm{num}}$. □

Proposition 6.13. *A negative definite, spherelike divisor can be contracted to either a smooth point or an ADE singularity and in the latter case is the pullback of a spherical divisor.*

Proof. If the spherelike divisor D contains no (-1)-curves, then it has to be a configuration of (-2)-curves, since the average among self-intersection numbers of all curves in D is -2 by Lemma 3.8. By Corollary 4.5 D is spherical. Now D is negative definite, and hence an ADE configuration of (-2)-curves, see for example [6, §3]. It is well-known that such a configuration can be contracted to an ADE singularity, which in turn gives $D \leq Z_{\mathrm{num}}$ by Proposition 6.12.

If D is properly spherelike, it contains a (-1)-curve E. As D is 1-connected, $(D-E).E \geq 1$, so $D.E \geq 0$. On the other hand D is negative definite, so $-1 \geq (D+E)^2 = -2 + 2D.E - 1$ and hence $D.E \leq 1$.

If $D.E = 0$, contract E and start over with a smaller spherelike divisor.

If $D.E = 1$, then $(D+E)^2 = -1$. By negative definiteness, $D+E$ is negatively filtered, and so $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{D+E}(D+E)) = 0$. On the other hand, the decomposition sequence yields a triangle $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_E(-D)) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D+E}) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_D)$. As $D.E = 1$, we get $H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{D+E}) = \Bbbk$. Altogether, we find that $D+E$ is a (-1)-divisor and, moreover, can be contracted to a smaller (-1)-divisor, since $(D+E).E = 0$. (As $D'.E' = 0$ for a (-1)-curve E' in a negative definite (-1)-divisor D', the curve E' can be contracted.)

Inductively contracting (-1)-curves E, we arrive either at $D.E = 1$ at some step, yielding a smooth point. Otherwise, we have $D.E = 0$ throughout, so that D eventually becomes the pullback of a spherical divisor D'. □

We end this section with two more examples, first of a divisor which contracts to an elliptic singularity, and then a spherelike divisor which is not negative definite.

Example 6.14 ([14, Ex. 4.20])**.** Consider the minimal resolution of the surface singularity $\{x^3 + y^3 + z^4 = 0\} \subset \Bbbk^3$, which is a minimally elliptic singularity, in particular not rational. Its numerical cycle Z_{num} is



The reduced divisor $D = (Z_{\mathrm{num}})_{\mathrm{red}}$ is a negative definite (-3)-divisor which can be twisted off to a single (-3)-curve. By contrast, an easy computation shows $\chi(\mathcal{O}_{Z_{\mathrm{num}}}) = 0$. Note that Z_{num} is not 1-decomposable, as $Z_{\mathrm{num}}.C = 2$ for all curves $C \prec Z_{\mathrm{num}}$. Moreover, Z_{num} is a negative definite divisor that is not Jacobi rigid.

Example 6.15. Let $D = D_n := B + E + C_1 + \cdots + C_n =$ 

where $B^2 = -3, E^2 = -1$ and $C_i^2 = -2$. Then $D.K = 0$ is obvious and D is reduced, so pruning leaves yields both a 1-decomposition and a negative filtration. Alternatively, one can first twist off the (-2)-curves, and then blow down the remaining (-1)-curve. In particular, D is essentially spherical.

We remark that D_n for $n > 1$ is not contractible to a rational singularity. This holds even in the analytic category, since $(B + 3E + C_1 + C_2)^2 = 2$ shows that D_n is not negative definite. The divisor D_1 is not the pull-back of any divisor, but contracts to a smooth point.

7. Classification of minimally curvelike divisors

7.1. **Graph-theoretical algorithm.** Curvelike divisors have a discrete, or combinatorial, flavour. More precisely, fixing the self-intersection number $-n$ and the topological type as a graph T, there are only finitely many building blocks, i.e. minimal $(-n)$-divisors. Here, we deal with exhausting these graphs algorithmically. There remains the question which of those graphs actually occur as dual intersection graphs of effective divisors (which are then necessarily $(-n)$-divisors), and this is taken up in 7.2.

Formally speaking, we consider weighted graphs with multiplicities below. Nonetheless, we will speak of 'curves' instead of 'vertices', and 'self-intersection number' instead of 'weight'.

(1) Start with all curves of multiplicity 1 and unknown self-intersection.
(2) Form a list of partially defined divisors on T (some curves may not yet have assigned a self-intersection number), increasing in each step one multiplicity $kC \mapsto (k+1)C$, such that the 1-decomposability condition is met. If $k = 1$ this fixes C^2. This list is finite.
(3) For the remaining entries, fill unassigned self-intersection numbers in all possible ways, admitting a negative filtration and satisfying $D.K = n - 2$ or, equivalently, $D^2 = -n$.
(4) Remove divisors having a (-1)-curve which can be contracted or a (-2)-curve which can be twisted off.

Graphs surviving the final step possess a 1-decomposition and a negative filtration, and have self-intersection number $-n$. Hence, if they are dual graphs of divisors, these are $(-n)$-divisors by Corollary 3.2. The resulting list then needs to be condensed, because it will contain multiple incarnations of the same divisor. The algorithm becomes more efficient if the following intermediate checks are also carried out during and after Step (2):

(2') Remove an entry from that list if there is a subdivisor violating the negatively closed property, e.g. -1—-1 or -1—-2—-1.
(2") Remove divisors having a (-1)-curve which can be contracted or a (-2)-curve which can be twisted off.

Since by Corollary 4.15, (-1)-divisors can always be worked down to (-1)-curves, here we investigate spherelike divisors.

Example 7.1. If T is a tree with two, three or four vertices, then no spherelike divisor on T is minimal. We show this if T is the four chain; the reasoning for the other cases is similar. The list of Step (2), cleaned up by (2'), is:

together with the reduced chain -?—-?—-?—-? which, by Proposition 7.3, cannot support a minimally spherelike divisor. The (-1)-curves in the first and third divisors can be contracted. The (-2)-curve in the second, and the leaf (-2)-curve in the last entry can be twisted off.

Example 7.2. We list all minimally spherelike divisors on five curves. Their existence as divisors (not just graphs) follows from Proposition 7.6, or can also easily checked by hand.



Proposition 7.3. *A reduced spherelike divisor is essentially spherical.*

Proof. We will show that D has a leaf (i.e. a curve component intersecting only one other curve) of self-intersection -1 or -2: such a curve can be blown down or twisted off, obtaining a smaller divisor with the same properties.

For a contradiction, assume that D is a reduced negatively closed tree such that $C^2 \leq -3$ for all leaves C. Put L for the subdivisor consisting of all, say l, leaves, and let $I \coloneqq D - L$ be the complement of all inner curves.

Note that $I \neq 0$ unless D is either a single curve or a 2-chain, neither of which is possible under the assumption. Now $I \neq 0$ implies four facts: First, $I.L = l$, as D is reduced and each leaf intersects exactly one inner curve, with multiplicity 1. Second, $L^2 \leq -3l$, as L is a disjoint union of l curves C with $C^2 \leq -3$. Third, $I^2 < 0$, as D is negatively closed. Fourth, $l \geq 2$. We obtain a contradiction from $D^2 = -2$:

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 = (I+L)^2 &= I^2 + 2I.L + L^2 = I^2 + 2l + L^2 \\ &\leq I^2 + 2l - 3l = I^2 - l < -l \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7.4. The proof of the proposition shows a bit more: if D is a reduced (-3)-divisor that is not a chain, then it is essentially a (-3)-curve. The provision is necessary, an example is ③—①—③.

7.2. **From graphs to divisors.** The previous subsection produces a list of the weighted graphs which can occur as the dual intersection graphs of divisors with prescribed properties. However, it is a subtle problem to decide which graphs can actually be realised by divisors.

Example 7.5. The following graph cannot be realised on any surface:



Suppose the contrary and let D be a rational reduced divisor with the dual intersection graph above. One can easily check that D is 1-decomposable (as it is reduced) and negatively filtered. Moreover, $D^2 = -2$, so D would be a spherelike divisor.

But if we iteratively blow-down the (-1)-curves next to the two middle curves, then we will end up after five steps with $C_1 + C_2 =$ ②—②. Such a configuration cannot exist on any surface, since then $C_1.(C_1 - 2C_2) = 0$ but $(C_1 - 2C_2)^2 > 0$ contradicting the Hodge Index Theorem [3, Cor. 2.4].

Many graphs can be realised, however. For the next statement, we consider a weighted tree T, with vertices denoted by C, and weights C^2. Write $v(C)$ for the valency of a vertex C, i.e. the number of vertices adjacent to C.

We introduce a local quantity $\sigma(C)$ for each vertex, which measures excess positivity, and a global quantity $b(T)$ counting the number of bad vertices:

$$\sigma(C) \coloneqq C^2 + v(C)$$
$$b(T) \coloneqq \#\{C \mid C^2 > -v(C)\} = \#\{C \mid \sigma(C) \geq 1\}.$$

Moreover, the *distance* $d(C, C')$ of two vertices is the number of edges in the shortest path connecting C and C'.

Proposition 7.6. *Let T be a finite weighted tree with badness $b = b(T)$, and bad vertices $C_1, \ldots, C_b$. There exists a reduced divisor on a rational surface with dual intersection graph T if $b \leq 1$ or one of the following hold:*
$b = 2$, $d(C_1, C_2) = 1$, and $\sigma(C_1) = 1$ or $\sigma(C_2) = 1$ or $\sigma(C_1) = \sigma(C_2) = 2$;
$b = 2$, $d(C_1, C_2) = 2$, and $\sigma(C_1) = \sigma(C_2) = 1$;
$b = 3$, and C_1, C_2, C_3 form a 3-chain with $\sigma(C_1) = \sigma(C_2) = \sigma(C_3) = 1$.

Remark 7.7. Minimal examples for the first clause of the proposition are ⓪—⊛ and ①—①. For the other two cases: ⓪—②—⓪ and ⓪—①—⓪; note that of these two, the former can be obtained from the latter by blowing-up. Moreover, that last chain can be obtained by blowing up the intersection point of ①—①, ignoring multiplicities.

Proof. It suffices to realise those trees as divisors D which satisfy the equality $C^2 = -v(C)$, i.e. $\sigma(C) = 0$, for all but the bad vertices: any other weighted tree with smaller prescribed self-intersection numbers can be obtained by blowing up appropriate interior points on the curves of D.

Assume $b = 0$. Then all leaves have weight -1. Thus we can contract each leaf in the numerical sense, i.e. remove it and increase the weight of its neighbour by 1. Moreover, the condition also guarantees that this process can be iterated, stopping at a single vertex of weight 0. We can revert this process on any surface with a 0-curve, e.g. $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Assume $b = 1$. We apply the same procedure, but now we end up with the single bad vertex of weight $m = \sigma(C_1) > 0$. Let $F_m \coloneqq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(m))$ be the Hirzebruch surface containing a smooth rational curve L with $L^2 = m$. Again the process can be reverted, starting with L and ending with a tree D of rational curves whose dual intersection graph is T.

Assume $b = 2$. We can numerically contract all vertices except for the two bad vertices C_1, C_2 and the path between them, obtaining ⓧ—②—⋯—②—ⓨ with $x \coloneqq \sigma(C_1) - 1$ and $y \coloneqq \sigma(C_2) - 1$. If C_1 and C_2 are adjacent, i.e. $d(C_1, C_2) = 1$, then each of the three cases can be realised on some Hirzebruch surface: ⓪—ⓜ on F_m and ①—① on $\mathbb{P}^2$. The chain ⓪—②—⓪ is a double blow-up of ①—①.

Assume $b = 3$. After contracting we arrive at ⓪—①—⓪ already mentioned in the remark above. □

Question 7.8. Which graphs can be realised as dual graphs of divisors?

In a related vein: given a rational rigid (or negatively closed) divisor D on some surface, can it be realised on a rational surface?

References

[1] M. Artin, *Some Numerical Criteria for Contractability of Curves on Algebraic Surfaces*, Amer. J. Math. **84** (1962), 485–496, available on JSTOR.

[2] M. Artin, *On Isolated Rational Singularities of Surfaces*, Amer. J. Math. **88** (1966), 129–136, available on JSTOR.
[3] L. Bădescu, *Algebraic Surfaces*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag (2001).
[4] T. Bauer, B. Harbourne, A.L. Knutsen, A. Küronya, S. Müller-Stach, X. Rolleau, T. Szemberg, *Negative curves on algebraic surfaces*, Duke Math. J. **213** (2013), also arXiv:1109.1881.
[5] W. Barth, K. Hulek, C. Peters, A. van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*, (Second edition), EMG 4, Springer-Verlag (2004).
[6] A. Durfee, *Fifteen characterizations of rational double points and simple critical points*, Enseign. Math. **25** (1979).
[7] E. García Barroso, P. González Pérez, P. Popescu-Pampu, *Ultrametric spaces of branches on arborescent singularities*, arXiv:1605.02229.
[8] H. Grauert, *Über Modifikationen und exzeptionelle analytische Mengen*, Math. Annalen **146**, 331–368 (1962), available on EuDML.
[9] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, GTM 52, Springer-Verlag (1977).
[10] A. Hochenegger, M. Kalck, D. Ploog, *Spherical subcategories in algebraic geometry*, to appear in Math. Nachr. (2016), also arXiv:1208.4046.
[11] A. Hochenegger, M. Kalck, D. Ploog, *Spherical subcategories in representation theory*, arXiv:1502.06838.
[12] D. Huybrechts, *Fourier-Mukai Transforms in Algebraic Geometry*, Oxford University Press (2006).
[13] H.B. Laufer, *On rational singularities*, Amer. J. Math. **94** (1972), 597–608, available on JSTOR.
[14] A. Némethi, *Five Lectures on Normal Surface Singularities*, Bolyai Soc. Math. Studies **8** (1999), 269–351, available on personal webpage.
[15] M. Reid, *Chapters on Algebraic Surfaces*, in "Complex Algebraic Geometry", Editor: J. Kollár, AMS (2000), also arXiv:alg-geom/9602006.
[16] R.S. Varga, *Matrix Iterative Analysis*, Springer-Verlag (2000).

Contact: hochenegger@math.uni-hannover.de dploog@math.fu-berlin.de